

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Paolo Pronesti,
Plaintiff

v.

Department of Family Services, et al.,
Defendants

2:15-cv-01994-JAD-PAL

Order Denying Motion to Amend

[ECF No. 9]

Pro se plaintiff Paolo Pronesti sued the Clark County District Attorney's Office, the Clark County Department of Child and Family Services (DFS), and a handful of DFS employees to challenge state-court custody proceedings. On March 13, 2017, I adopted the magistrate judge's recommendation and dismissed and closed this case. Pronesti now seeks leave to file an amended complaint, arguing that his claims arise under the Constitution and 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981 and 1983.

As I explained in my dismissal order, federal courts do not have appellate jurisdiction over state courts,¹ nor over child-custody matters.² Because Pronesti's claims constitute a de facto appeal of the family court's custody determination, I lack jurisdiction over his claims and the proposed amended complaint does not cure this fatal defect. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Pronesti's motion for leave to amend [ECF No. 9] is **DENIED**. Pronesti is cautioned that any further motions filed in this closed case will be summarily denied.

Dated this 12th day of April, 2017.



Jennifer A. Dorsey
United States District Judge

¹ ECF No. 3 (citing *Rooker v. Fid Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413 (1923); *D.C. Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 482–86 (1983)).

² *Id.* at 4 (citing *Ankenbrandt v. Richards*, 504 U.S. 689 (1992)).